PROVISIONAL
For participants only

NPT/CONF.IV/SR.5
30 August 1990

Original: ENGLISH

FOURTH REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 5TH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 22 August 1990, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. de RIVERO (Peru)

later: Ms. MASON (Canada)

CONTENTS

Request by Oman for observer status

General debate (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

GE.90-66027/2321B

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

REQUEST BY OMAN FOR OBSERVER STATUS

The PRESIDENT said that the Secretary-General of the Conference had received a request by Oman for observer status. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Conference decided to grant the request.

It was so decided.

GENERAL DEBATE (agenda item 12) (continued)

Mr. KORSGAARD-PEDERSEN (Denmark) said that, with its world-wide support and more than 140 States Parties, the NPT was the most successful multilateral agreement in the disarmament and arms limitation field. It had a unique position in the matter of nuclear arms control, because its subject was the nuclear weapon itself and because it covered not only East and West but also North and South aspects. It was, however, a matter for concern that some nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-capable States continued to remain outside the NPT. His delegation urged them to accede to it as soon as possible in order to make it a fully global treaty.

The NPT had been successful in fulfilling its primary goal of non-proliferation. Since its entry into force, no non-nuclear-weapon State Party had changed status with regard to nuclear weapons. At the same time, the possibility that some non-nuclear-weapons States had acquired, or were trying to acquire, nuclear weapon capabilities posed a threat to the non-proliferation régime and, together with the spread of missile technology, a potential danger to international peace and security.

His delegation had hoped that the Conference would meet in an international climate characterized by a high degree of optimism, brought about by the very positive developments in East-West relations. Recent developments elsewhere, however, had cast a deep shadow over the world political situation. He hoped that the Conference could nevertheless be conducted in a constructive atmosphere and that its outcome would make an important contribution to achieving the NPT's three main goals: to avert the spread of nuclear weapons, to limit and reduce nuclear weapons, and to promote international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

There had been promising developments in the negotiations on nuclear disarmament called for under article VI of the NPT. Remarkable progress had been achieved in the bilateral disarmament negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union with the conclusion of the INF treaty and the declared intention of both States to conclude a START treaty on the

reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms - a development very much in the spirit of the NPT. Those important first steps should be followed by further substantial cuts in the nuclear arsenals, with the ultimate aim of completely eliminating nuclear weapons. Again, the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban treaty would be a very effective measure in support of the purposes of the NPT and would make it more attractive for non-Parties to accede to it. Denmark had consistently supported the early conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban on all nuclear tests in all environments by all States and for all time. The Conference on Disarmament was the appropriate forum for multilateral negotiations on that issue and he welcomed the agreement it had reached on a mandate for the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban. Another multilateral effort in the same field was the convening in January 1991 of an Amendment Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water.

In the bilateral negotiations on nuclear testing between the United States and the Soviet Union, the agreement on the verification of the Threshold Test-Ban Treaty and on the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty had expanded the area of verification procedures. He urged the two parties to continue their negotiations aiming at substantial constraints on nuclear testing, with the final objective of a comprehensive test ban. The establishment of regional nuclear-weapon-free zones also helped to strengthen the concept of non-proliferation, and another very important measure would be effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

The NPT had formed the basis for international nuclear trade as well as international co-operation in peaceful uses of atomic energy under the IAEA. The IAEA full-scope safeguards system was a crucial element in the non-proliferation régime and his delegation would urge all States which had not yet done so to place their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. The obligation for Parties to the NPT to conclude a safeguards agreement under article III was unequivocal. The final objective must be that all civil nuclear facilities in the world should become subject to the IAEA safeguards. In view of the progress in nuclear technology and the substantial increase in nuclear material on a world-wide basis, the continued effectiveness and credibility of the IAEA safeguards had to be ensured.

The strong commitment of the five Nordic countries to further strengthening the non-proliferation régime had been reflected in a number of initiatives during the years in relation to the NPT. A memorandum stating their views had been issued as an official document of the Conference (NPT/CONF.IV/18). Moreover, earlier in 1990, the Nordic Governments had approached all non-NPT Parties appealing to the Governments concerned to accede to the NPT without delay. In a declaration issued in June 1990 by the European Council, the Member States of the European Community had stressed the great importance they attached to the maintenance of an effective international nuclear non-proliferation régime and their determination to work actively to secure a successful outcome for the present Review Conference.

Since the NPT helped to assure the security of all nations, both Parties and non-Parties, the world was a safer place. It was therefore vital for the Treaty to remain in force and for the 1995 Conference to decide that it should continue to be operative indefinitely. A positive outcome to the present Review Conference would further strengthen the NPT up to 1995 when the crucial decision would be made.

The Conference should strive to make a complete and balanced review of the implementation of the NPT over the past five years. It should also consider means to further strengthen the non-proliferation régime and the implementation of the NPT. Above all, it should reaffirm the support of the Parties for the NPT and stress the contribution it made to international and regional security and stability. The goal should be to produce a final document that was constructive and offered a relevant and significant contribution to future international nuclear non-proliferation efforts within the framework of the NPT.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands) said that seldom had the world begun a year in such a hopeful mood as in 1990, but equally seldom had the dangers been more apparent as the result of regional conflict. Advances in democracy, human rights and arms control were not limited to Europe but were also visible elsewhere. A world free of aggression and violence was coming a step closer, but the events of the past few weeks had shown how remote that goal was and, at the same time, how well the Charter of the United Nations could work when political unanimity in the Security Council was sustained.

The aim of the Parties to the NPT was to avert the danger of a nuclear war as a result of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The NPT had been the result of a growing awareness that the greater the number of countries

possessing nuclear weapons, the greater the risk of those weapons being used. There could be no doubt that regional conflicts would become far more serious if the non-proliferation policy was less scrupulously followed. The NPT had effectively promoted international stability and thereby fulfilled one of its principal objectives.

The NPT had also been of crucial importance as the major post-war multilateral arms control agreement. It had strengthened the belief that the spread of nuclear weapons could not be allowed to go unchecked. The preamble noted the intention of the Parties "to achieve at the earliest possible date the cessation of the nuclear arms race" and article VI reflected that same undertaking. In the past five years considerable progress had been made in the field of arms control and more tangible results could be expected in the near future. Important agreements had been reached by the United States and the Soviet Union on major outstanding issues in that connection. There had also been considerable advances in regional and world-wide disarmament over the past five years and the negotiations in Vienna on conventional stability in Europe could be expected to lead to an agreement within a few months. The discussions on a treaty on chemical weapons had reached an advanced stage. General and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, one of the aims of the NPT, still seemed rather remote, but there was some indication of movement in the right direction. After years of stagnation, some progress had been achieved on the subject of nuclear-weapon testing and discussion on that item had been resumed in the Conference on Disarmament. It was important that the number and yield of nuclear tests should be reduced to a minimum level, thereby offering the prospect of a comprehensive test ban at the appropriate moment.

Together with Hungary and Sweden, the Netherlands had submitted a working paper on the subject of a "Prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities" (NPT/CONF.IV/22), in the hope that it would lead to enhanced awareness of the issue in question. That awareness should be expressed in the final document of the present Review Conference.

While arms control served the security of the Parties well, the issue could be looked at in a broader context. A few years previously, nuclear-weapon States had issued assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Those welcome assurances were still valid. The discussion on security assurances towards

non-nuclear-weapon States would certainly be influenced by the recent political and military developments. His country supported efforts to arrive at appropriate effective international arrangements on that matter.

His delegation looked forward to decisive progress in arms control and an overall reduction in the number of nuclear weapons. At the same time, it was fully aware of the dangers which could affect the NPT. There were still some 20 non-party States, including some which had the capacity to make nuclear weapons. The success of the NPT would depend on the willingness of threshold States and other States outside the NPT to accede to it, or at least to comply with its provisions. He appealed to all those States which had not yet acceded to the NPT to do so.

Another danger arose from within: the Treaty obliged non-nuclear-weapon States Parties to refrain from any activity which might lead to the acquisition of nuclear weapons. The system of safeguards set up to verify that obligation, however, applied only to "source or special fissionable material". Other materials and equipment, even those which were essential for the manufacture of nuclear weapons, did not fall under that system and, unfortunately, there has been attempts to acquire such material and equipment. The Conference could not ignore that fundamental issue, and should, in addition, make it clear that Parties must not assist non-nuclear-weapon States in any possible way to acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. Both nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States should refrain from providing such assistance. Countries exporting nuclear technology had a special responsibility in that regard. His country's policy was that exports of nuclear material to non-Parties to the NPT, as well as specially designed or prepared equipment, were allowed only if all nuclear activities in the recipient State were under IAEA safeguards.

Yet another danger arose from the fact that not all signatory States had complied with the obligation to conclude a safeguards agreement with the IAEA within two years of accession. As recognized in the European Council's declaration on nuclear proliferation, in June 1990, IAEA safeguards were the corner-stone of an effective non-proliferation régime.

The NPT established a close connecton between non-proliferation, arms control and co-operation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy. In recent years, co-operation had taken many different forms, both within the framework of the IAEA and outside it. In that connection, the IAEA had submitted a

background paper on its activities relevant to article IV of the NPT (NPT/CONF.IV/13). It was important that such co-operation should be further developed over the coming years. The global energy supply, in which nuclear energy played a role, required co-operation, and safe use of nuclear energy also called for fresh initiatives involving international co-operation.

In 1995, the States Parties would have to decide for how long they wished the Treaty to be extended, thus giving an implicit indication of the value they attached to the NPT. The forthcoming discussions in the present Conference would set the course for the review, and the extension of the NPT, which it was to be hoped would take place in a single conference in 1995.

It should be stressed that the NPT had proved its value by making a significant and indispensable contribution to international stability. There was no real alternative which could command the support of important nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States alike. While what had been achieved gave cause for satisfaction, it was essential to continue the work on the task set by the NPT, namely a further strengthening of the international norm against proliferation. The next five years might well be decisive in that regard.

Mr. KARHILO (Finland) said that his Government regarded the NPT as irreplaceable: it was a corner-stone of security for everyone, whether or not a State Party, and it was also the foundation for international nuclear trade and for the use of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

Finland welcomed the fact that, since the previous Conference in 1985, awareness of the indispensability of the NPT had grown. It was pleased to see China and France participate as observers for the first time and hoped that those two States would soon accede to the NPT. As stated in their memorandum (NPT/CONF.IV/18), the Nordic Governments were convinced that universal adherence to the NPT and full compliance with its obligations were the best approach to achieving the goals of the NPT, namely to avert the spread of nuclear weapons, to eliminate and reduce nuclear weapons, and to promote international co-operation in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The period under review had seen a fundamental change for the better in East-West relations and the danger of global nuclear war was at its lowest level ever. The changing role of nuclear weapons in military strategy was even more important in the long run than reductions in numbers and types of nuclear weapons. With the crumbling of East-West confrontation, it had become

possible to reduce nuclear forces to a minimum. In Europe, a process was under way whereby the adversaries of yesterday were becoming tomorrow's partners in security. For Finland, a European neutral, that development was a source of profound satisfaction.

The present crisis in the Gulf area underlined the importance of effective barriers against the spread and use of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, and it also testified to the urgency of a total ban on nuclear weapons. In Finland's view, the basic obligations of non-transfer and non-acquisition of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, as embodied in articles I and II of the NPT, had been complied with. The letter of the NPT had been observed but there was reason for concern as to the spirit. Article I might not dictate, but it certainly implied, unflagging and consistent efforts by nuclear-weapon States to deny potential proliferators any assistance and to persuade them to cease all suspect activities.

A grave danger to international peace and security persisted inasmuch as some non-nuclear-weapon States might have already acquired or be actively pursuing nuclear-weapon capability; such danger was particularly acute in regions where tensions were already running high. Where there were doubts, States should make known their situation and become Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The acceptance of safeguards in accordance with article III gave effect and expression to the fundamental commitment by each non-nuclear-weapon State Party under article II. Prompt conclusion of a safeguards agreement with the IAEA was a sine qua non for the credibility of the commitments under article II.

The period since the previous Conference had seen a change with far-reaching implications. As a result of the incident at Chernobyl, peaceful use of nuclear energy had come under a cloud. Assuring nuclear safety should be viewed not only as a national but also as an international obligation, something that the States Parties should bear in mind when implementing the provisions of article IV. Since the Treaty had come into force, world production of nuclear energy had grown more than twenty-fold, and a development of such magnitude would not have been possible without the Treaty and related safeguards agreement. For the energy economies of many countries, such as Finland, dependent on the availability of nuclear fuel or services from abroad, the continued functioning of international trade and the arrangements based on the Treaty must be guaranteed.

Effective safeguards were a prerequisite for the implementation of the Treaty. The IAEA safeguards system had been functioning successfully but, in order to continue to do so, the Parties to the Treaty must co-operate more fully with the Agency. Inspection efforts could be facilitated and information provided more promptly. Despite the financing problems being faced by the Agency the necessary resources must be provided so that it could administer growing safeguards activities. At the same time, more attention should be paid to improving safeguards methods. His country considered that all non-nuclear-weapon States should accept full-scope safeguards for their nuclear activities and, to that end, urged all States to require such safeguards as a condition for their nuclear exports.

As to the ultimate purpose of the Treaty in contributing to the prevention of nuclear war, for the first time in history some nuclear weapons had actually been eliminated and more substantial cuts were foreseen for the future. Other ancilliary measures to improve stability and prevent nuclear miscalculation had also been agreed on. However, the same could not be said for efforts to achieve a nuclear-test ban, which Finland considered to be the surest means of slowing down the development of nuclear weapons. A complete ban on nuclear testing would also remove the related environental risks; environmental concerns had contributed considerably to the decision to ban atmospheric tests under the Partial Test-Ban Treaty and scientific evidence suggested that there was no such thing as environmentally safe underground testing either.

His country was particularly concerned about tests in the Arctic, which was a singularly vulnerable environment and where the utmost care was needed to avoid the risks of radioactive pollution. The adequacy of safety measures at test sites was being questioned by countries, including his own, which feared that they were receiving radioactivity from test explosions in their vicinity. Nuclear-weapon States should invite independent experts from affected States to familiarize themselves with safety measures at test sites. Finland welcomed the signing of the verification protocols to the United States-Soviet Threshold Treaties, which should lead to further constraints in testing. The Amendment Conference for the Partial Test Ban Treaty afforded an opportunity for all States to discuss issues relating to the banning of nuclear tests and it was to be hoped that it would narrow the

differences enough to enable real progress to be made at the appropriate forum - the recently established Ad hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament.

States which had refrained from the option of acquiring nuclear weapons by joining the Treaty had the right to expect the nuclear-weapon States to renounce the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against them. As political perceptions and military doctrines changed favourably, a new look at the issue of security assurances would be justified. His delegation appreciated the proposals made in that respect by Nigeria and Egypt. In its view, security assurances should be binding and comprehensive and should ensure respect for the equality and integrity of all non-nuclear-weapon States having committed themselves to non-proliferation. While recent developments had helped to enhance the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, they did not obviate the need for effective security assurances as long as nuclear weapons existed.

The regional approach to non-proliferation, acknowledged by article VII of the Treaty, could effectively complement the global undertaking. Indeed, the Treaties of Rarotonga and Tlatelolco were intended to do just that. Finland itself had long sought to consolidate the existing nuclear-weapon-free status of the Nordic countries and considered that the changing security situation in Europe had further strengthened that status. It would therefore continue to co-operate closely with the other Nordic countries on that matter.

The NPT was the most widely accepted international security agreement. It served to stabilize the world with respect to the most destructive weapons in existence, acted as a spur to disarmament efforts and provided the safest available means to derive peaceful benefits from nuclear technology. The Nordic Governments therefore supported efforts aimed at ensuring the prolongation of the Treaty indefinitely and thus the continued effectiveness of the non-proliferation régime. His delegation believed that such efforts should begin soon after the current Review Conference.

Ms. Mason (Canada), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Mr. DATO BIN HITAM (Malaysia) said that more than any other instrument in international relations, the Non-Proliferation Treaty dealt with a very crucial concern of mankind: to ensure survival by preventing mass destruction. There was, however, a gulf between the lofty purposes of the Treaty and the provisions of its implementing articles. In a practical

manner, the Treaty accepted the notion that a small number of States already in possession of nuclear weapons could keep them, whereas others had undertaken not to acquire or develop them. Nuclear weapons had thus assumed a decisive role as the "weapons of deterrence" of the super-Powers and, for over two decades, the Treaty had been caught up in super-Power rivalries, resulting in inadequate implementation of the provisions on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy on the one hand and the potential development of nuclear-weapon capability by other States on the other.

Malaysia had earlier subscribed to the Treaty, in the conviction that it provided a sound beginning for global denuclearization and a foundation for the establishment of a régime of international co-operation for the development of nuclear science and technology for peaceful uses, thus ultimately becoming a framework for the development of nuclear science and technology for the well-being and safety of mankind. However, from such a standpoint, the achievements of the Treaty over the past 20 years had not been encouraging. Indeed, the many United Nations and international resolutions concerning the acquisition of nuclear-weapon capability were a manifestation of well-founded concern about nuclear proliferation, compounded by the very urgent and real threats of other forms of mass destruction - from chemical, radiological and biological weapons, for example

However, despite such weaknesses, the NPT's importance to the safety and well-being of mankind had not diminished. The Conference was an opportunity to reaffirm adherence to it and renew determination to support the programmes which had been adopted to achieve its objectives. It was one of the earliest international instruments to have recognized that mankind shared a common destiny, and the full attainment of its objectives was of concern to all States. It was gratifying to note the growing realization by the international community of that common concern and of global interdependence among States and peoples. For that reason, his delegation called for a clear programme of action to secure universal accession to the Treaty under the terms of international law and practice. It was undesirable that large sectors of humanity should not be covered by security standards adhered to by the Parties to the Treaty.

His delegation also regarded the Conference as an occasion to reaffirm the call to continue and strengthen the Treaty beyond 1995. Deep changes that were positive and fostered international peace and co-operation were taking

place in the international scene. His delegation was encouraged by the largely positive stands taken by the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union towards outstanding NPT issues and urged other developed countries to do likewise.

Such positive trends were, however, accompanied by signs of instability as societies grappled with political, economic and social reforms following the reduction of East-West tensions and rivalry. The Conference must clearly call for an end to such tendencies and for the initiation of remedial measures with proper regard for the long-term interests of mankind, societies and individuals. Once a common human destiny was accepted as a clear basic strategy of the Treaty in its next phase of development, the Conference would have taken a very important decision. To that end, the Conference should find the political will to call in a final document for the continuation of the Treaty as a precursor of complete nuclear disarmament and of international co-operation in nuclear science and technology for the safety and well-being of mankind.

In addition to such basic considerations, other important issues should also be addressed. International developments suggested that the Treaty could not stand alone if it was to retain its pivotal role in global peace and stability and that fresh approaches must be made to reinforce it. Threats of the use of nuclear weapons must not be available to any State and no State should feel compelled to seek security in nuclear deterrence. All countries, must rely on the guarantee of the United Nations collective security system as the only fair and just system that would not undermine the safety and well-being of mankind. International efforts and wisdom must be focused on examining that system and the Parties to the Treaty must move ahead towards the achievement of complete nuclear disarmament and develop the widest application of nuclear science for peaceful uses.

Areas declared as nuclear-weapon-free zones now made up more than a quarter of the earth's surface. In South-East Asia, members of ASEAN had declared their determination to establish a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, which would be free from nuclear weapons. His country was pleased that no regional State had objected to such an effort and hoped that all obstacles to the establishment of the zone would be removed in the near future. In that context it would be useful if the Review Conference would take cognizance of the ASEAN effort and urge States Parties to the NPT and others to encourage its realization.

It was also necessary to strengthen the safeguards system and programmes in order to enhance confidence in the Treaty and incentives for its universal acceptance. He therefore supported the call by the IAEA's Director-General at the opening meeting of the Conference for an enhanced system of safeguards that would cover areas of weakness inherent in the Treaty. Another, equally important aspect of safeguards as a confidence-building instrument was adherence by all Parties. The Treaty should not be weakened in any manner through non-compliance or conditionality.

As the agenda of the Conference suggested, a great deal of work on the Treaty remained to be done. In that respect his delegation felt that fresh impetus should be injected into efforts for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy; transfer of technology was not only an incentive for universalization of the Treaty but was also a disincentive for recourse to the nuclear weapons option. His delegation agreed with others that special significance was attached to the current Conference, implying greater willingness to proceed earnestly to discharge obligations and responsibilities and vigorously pursue the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban treaty, the elimination of all tactical nuclear forces, the prevention of an arms race in space, and a prohibition on the production and trade of fissile materials for nuclear weapons. In the context of improved East-West relations, he called upon Parties to the Treaty to rise to the challenges of the day and fulfil the great expectations of all mankind.

Mr. PIREK (Czech and Slovak Federal Republic) said that his country's two nations, engaged in rediscovering the ideals and principles of pluralistic democracy and the authentic values of European civilization, were eager to assist in introducing new viable international structures. Together with other European nations, the United States and Canada, Czechoslovakia was endeavouring to devise an original concept for a reliable security system in Europe and the adequate institutionalization of the Helsinki process. It was confident that the results of the two sets of negotiations taking place in Vienna, as well as the Paris Summit of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, would make a significant contribution to the attainment of those goals. Unfortunately, the prevailing positive trends were disrupted by irresponsible power ambitions. In his opinion, the solution to the current explosive situation in the Gulf lay in the implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty, which had stood the test of time and would undoubtedly count among the foundation stones of the new security system emerging in Europe and the world at large, constituted an important norm of international law, exerting considerable influence on the development of international relations in the field of arms reduction and disarmament. The Treaty enjoyed prestige among States and, in terms of the number of States Parties, ranked among the most representative disarmament instruments adopted since the Second World War. His Government was convinced of the Treaty's continuing viability beyond the year 1995 and was opposed to any pointless revision aimed at weakening or devaluing the Treaty.

It was gratified to note, that in the past five years, there had been no breach of the Treaty and that all States Parties, both nuclear and non-nuclear, had continued to comply with their commitments. That fact was important above all for the review of the Treaty's key provisions contained in articles I and II. Although reports were received from time to time concerning attempts - generally by non-party States - to manufacture a nuclear weapon, there had so far been no direct official evidence to confirm such activities. Notwithstanding the substantial growth of trade in nuclear technology and the world-wide utilization of nuclear energy, the official list of countries possessing nuclear weapons remained unchanged. That, however, should not diminish the world's vigilance and alertness, particularly with regard to efforts by some States gradually to build up a base for the development and manufacture of components of nuclear weapons. The same applied to the sensitive and increasingly topical issue of procurement of delivery systems and their technology. The presence of nuclear weapons, especially in conflict-ridden regions, would pose a serious threat to strategic stability and universal peace.

His Government was pleased to note that the number of non-nuclear-States Parties to the Treaty had progressively increased over the years, a positive trend which attested to the Treaty's importance and credibility, and joined in the appeal to countries still outside the Treaty to review their position and accede to it as soon as possible.

The system of safeguards developed on the basis of article III and applied through the International Atomic Energy Agency offered a possibility of objectively reviewing the question of compliance with the NPT. In recent years the Agency had developed and verified a system of safeguards for nuclear

equipment of all kinds, and its experienced inspectors added to the credibility of the results of verification activities. Nevertheless, his delegation was not fully satisfied with those activities. The basic document of the safeguards system dated back more than 20 years and some of its parameters no longer corresponded to current needs. After carrying out a thorough analysis of the situation, his Government had, within the framework of IAEA, put forward a proposal for a modified approach to the application of safeguards. Flexible implementation of that proposal would eliminate existing shortcomings, ease the financial implications and contribute towards development of safeguards that could ensure effective as well as reliable control of the development of nuclear energy into the twenty-first century. At the same time, his Government was convinced that the Treaty's prestige would be substantially enhanced if the nuclear Powers subjected all of their peaceful nuclear activities to IAEA safeguards. Again, it recommended the most economical approach while stressing practical aspects. In its view, the submission and verification of exhaustive reports on the materials balance should be combined with the gradual expansion of a new system of random inspections.

Despite the tragic accident at Chernobyl, the peaceful uses of nuclear energy had continued to expand, attention being mainly focused on improving the quality of safety measures. Nuclear energy remained the most promising resource for meeting the energy needs of many countries. His Government therefore advocated further mutually beneficial development of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy subject to the observance of the international safeguards in accordance with article IV of the Treaty. In that context, it appreciated the conclusions of the PUNE Conference held in Geneva in 1986. In his country, the development of peaceful uses of nuclear energy was unthinkable without international co-operation. Environmental and economic considerations had led his Government to the decision to utilize the country's uranium deposits in order to launch a relatively extensive nuclear energy programme. Eight blocks of light-water reactors with outputs of 440 MW per unit were currently in operation and another four blocks of the same capacity, as well as two 1,000 MW blocks, were under construction. All those power stations had been built according to Soviet designs and the fuel elements had also been supplied by the USSR until the present. For many years, his country had also enjoyed co-operation with Western producers of

nuclear plant and equipment; all the blocks in operation included diagnostic systems supplied by Siemens, and a Western-made comprehensive control system was to be installed at the nuclear power plant being built at Mochovce. So far as the construction of new nuclear plants was concerned, Czechoslovakia had established contacts with firms in the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Finland, Italy, the Soviet Union and other countries, with a view to acquiring the most advanced technical equipment so as to guarantee maximum security.

The new situation also called for fundamental changes in the fuel cycle. Czechoslovakia was at present studying the possibility of long-term storage in its own territory of spent fuel which, in the past, had been returned to the USSR, as well as the possibility of its being processed by a suitable partner. The preparation of co-operation agreements with other States in the nuclear field involved certain problems of a legislative nature. Czechoslovakia's export and import policy had hitherto been based exclusively on the non-proliferation principle embodied in the NPT. Issues relating to ensuring safeguards outside the Treaty framework or in the event of IAEA being unable to discharge its duties under article III were not as yet regulated by the national legislation. Such regulation was, however, indispensable in order to conclude agreements with a number of States. His Government intended to look to the best solutions and experience of other States Parties in preparing the necessary legal adjustments.

As to the review of articles V, VI and VII, he wished to emphasize that the gradual and consistent construction of a world free of nuclear weapons was a priority in his country's foreign policy. Like most other participants in the Conference, Czechoslovakia was not fully satisfied with the implementation of the provisions of article VI, although it was true that more had been done in that field since the 1985 Review Conference than in all previous years taken together. His country expected that process to continue and hoped to see it advance to the stage of multilateral negotiations in the near future. In that context, it greatly appreciated the Soviet-United States INF Agreement, in whose implementation it was partly involved. The Agreement, which had launched a process of real disarmament in the nuclear field, should be supplemented in the foreseeable future by a radical reduction in the two Powers' offensive strategic weapons, something his Government strongly favoured. In view of the London Declaration of the NATO countries in July 1990, the start of negotiations on the elimination of all tactical

nuclear weapons in Europe seemed promising. The time was approaching when the process of nuclear disarmament should be joined by the other nuclear Powers. It was to be hoped that their participation in the relevant negotiations would not be linked to any preconditions. The first step towards that end might be the adoption of so-called negative assurances.

General and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests was the most effective way of halting the escalation of armaments and achieving nuclear disarmament. Unfortunately, the results expected had not been achieved; although the additional protocols to the Soviet-United States agreements on nuclear-weapon tests of 1974 and 1976 had been signed at the Soviet-United States summit in Washington earlier in 1990, they had not yet been ratified. It was to be hoped that resumed negotiations would result in a significant limitation by both Powers of the number and energy yield of their nuclear tests. At the Conference on Disarmament, the matter had remained in a state of protracted stagnation. The Czechoslovak delegation was among those trying to find ways of overcoming the impasse. It was to be hoped that the recently established Ad Hoc Committee would at long last produce tangible results. One possible solution might be found in the non-aligned countries' proposal that the validity of the Partial Test-Ban Treaty should be extended to cover underground testing. Czechoslovakia, for its part, was making responsible and serious preparations for the United Nations conference to be held in New York at the beginning of 1991.

An essential element in strengthening the non-proliferation régime was respect for the status of existing nuclear-weapon-free zones, including those established under the Tlatelolco and Rarotonga Treaties. Czechoslovakia supported all constructive proposals for the creation of new nuclear-weapon-free zones.

His Government considered that all international institutions and forums concerned should energetically step up their efforts to solve the whole set of issues relating to nuclear disarmament and was strongly in favour of enhancing the role of the United Nations in that regard. At the same time, it also advocated a radical improvement in the effectiveness of multilateral disarmament mechanisms, including the Conference on Disarmament.

Lastly the Treaty had fully proved itself in the 20 years since its coming into force. It was to be hoped that the present Conference and its final document would help to preserve and strengthen that important instrument at the threshold of a new millenium.

Mr. ENE (Romania) said that the present Review Conference, even more than its predecessors, afforded an opportunity to assess the results achieved both individually and collectively in the field of nuclear non-proliferation, with special emphasis on what still remained to be done. The profound changes taking place in international life, including both positive developments and alarming convulsions, the progress achieved and the efforts in making headway towards the reduction of nuclear weapons, and the fact that the present Conference was in many ways a prelude to the crucial Review Conference of 1995 made the occasion a special one. His country approached the issues on the agenda with realism and hoped that the Conference's work would be conducted in a positive and constructive spirit so as to give fresh impetus to the implementation of the NPT in its entirety.

Romania was fulfilling in good faith the obligations it had assumed under the Non-Proliferation Treaty and it co-operated with other States Parties in achieving the NPT's objectives. Soon after the Revolution of December 1989, his Government had issued a statement declaring null and void any agreements concluded by the former dictatorial régime that might be in contradiction with the international obligations assumed by Romania in the field of nuclear non-proliferation, as, indeed, in any other field. Romania had also joined the group of countries exporters of nuclear materials, equipment and technologies by officially accepting the non-proliferation standards agreed upon by those countries. At the beginning of August 1990, it had formally joined the IAEA's Guidelines for Nuclear Transfers. Other similar measures in the field of non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction were under way. Romania was ready to join international arrangements with regard to the non-proliferation of chemical weapons, and action had been taken at national level to provide the necessary regulations and machinery which would guarantee strict non-proliferation controls and co-operation with other States on that issue under conditions of privatization and a market economy.

Against a background of positive developments in Europe and other parts of the world, the past five years had also been marked by notable developments in regard to non-proliferation. Horizontal and vertical nuclear non-proliferation had become one of the international community's central concerns. Positive experience acquired in that field had extended to chemical and biological weapons and, more recently, to the means of delivery of such weapons. The agreements reached, as well as the fact that other important agreements were being negotiated, were to be welcomed.

The peaceful uses of nuclear energy enjoyed widespread recognition as an important instrument of economic and social development. His Government welcomed the increased IAEA concern for nuclear power-plant safety and the Agency's active contribution in promoting international co-operation. The Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident and the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency, both of which had been ratified by Romania three months previously, offered a firm legal foundation for such activities. Another step in the right direction would be to assure the physical security of nuclear plants against military attack, and his Government welcomed the initiative taken by Sweden, the Netherlands and Hungary in bringing that issue before the Conference.

The positive results achieved since the entry into force of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demonstrated the important role that the NPT played in maintaining international peace and security and promoting development, something that must be borne in mind in 1995 when the States Parties met to decide on the Treaty's further duration. In view of the recent positive developments in international relations and the democratization and improved human rights situation in Europe, the coming five years offered a unique opportunity to prepare the groundwork for the abolition of nuclear weapons. The Conference sought to give fresh impetus to that goal by improving upon the inadequacies of the non-proliferation régime so as to make the spread of nuclear weapons more difficult. The Conference must also attach priority to the early completion of the Soviet-United States negotiations on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic nuclear weapons, the beginning of a new series of negotiations on short-range nuclear missiles in Europe and a re-evaluation of nuclear weapons strategy in the light of new political realities. It was also important to give legal force to the obligation of States not to resort to the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The issue of security assurances for non-nuclear States should no longer create difficulties. The steps taken to reduce nuclear weapons were most gratifying, but such efforts must also help achieve another objective of the Treaty - a ban on all nuclear tests. Romania welcomed the recent initiative by six non-aligned States in that matter.

To be effective, any non-proliferation régime must also include measures to prevent access to nuclear materials, equipment and technology for non-peaceful uses. In that connection, Romania fully supported the IAEA safeguards and other international arrangements in the field of transfers, an

essential part of the non-proliferation régime that should be valid for all States. By the same token, the peaceful use of nuclear materials and technology should be encouraged without discrimination.

Lastly, it was satisfying to see that a number of non-States Parties were participating in the Confernece, for the NPT was one of the main pillars of international peace and stability.

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece) welcomed the presence of two nuclear-weapon States, France and China, as observers and called upon them to accede to the Treaty. It was to be hoped that the NPT, with its increasing acceptance by the international community, would continue to dissuade non-nuclear-weapon States from seeking nuclear-weapon capability. Greece, one of the first States to have signed and ratified the Treaty, was firmly committed to the NPT's goals and to implementation of the Treaty, which still played a crucial role in maintaining international peace and security.

Greece had always recognized the right of every State to benefit from nuclear energy for peaceful uses. Unfortunately, that right had not always been realized under credible and effective international safeguards. An equitable and stable framework for international nuclear trade was essential. International co-operation would be severely disrupted if the safeguards system were to be abandoned. Greece therefore strongly supported the application of IAEA safeguards on a universal basis and acknowledged the indispensable role played by the Agency through its safeguards controls, which helped ensure the effectiveness of the non-proliferation régime. On the European level, the Euratom safeguards were applied within the European Community, and the results were verified by the IAEA.

His delegation reaffirmed its full support of IAEA activities in the fields of nuclear safety and co-operation on nuclear research and development. Studies conducted by the Agency on the impact of the Chernobyl accident had demonstrated that national and international nuclear safety were inextricably linked. The same applied to problems of nuclear waste disposal. In that context, Greece would also support any efforts to remove the current lacunae in the international safeguards and the non-proliferation régime.

Despite the continuing risk that yet more countries might acquire nuclear weapons and the fact that a number of States continued to remain outside the non-proliferation régime, important progress had been achieved in recent years: the INF Treaty, the Stockholm Conference on Disarmament in Europe

agreement, the verification protocols for the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Treaty on Peaceful Nuclear Explosions, and the agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to destroy chemical weapons were all encouraging signs that the two super-Powers were on the right path towards genuine nuclear disarmament and a reduction in vertical proliferation. His delegation looked forward to further progress towards the completion by the end of 1990 of a number of bilateral agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union on strategic nuclear weapons and chemical weapons.

A comprehensive test ban would have special meaning for the non-proliferation régime and should remain a long-term objective of the nuclear-weapon States. The step-by-step approach undertaken by the two super-Powers towards achieving further limitations on nuclear testing and their commitment to a prompt ratification of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Treaty on Peaceful Nuclear Explosions should not be regarded as being a negative aspect of the implementation of article VI of the Treaty. Another positive development was the establishment in July 1990 at the Conference on Disarmament of an Ad Hoc Committee on nuclear tests.

It was regrettable that not all States had become Parties to the NPT which continued to be of vital importance in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and thus enhancing international security and stability. The present Conference must be used to ensure that, in 1995, the Treaty was extended for an indefinite period.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.